

GLENN B. McCORMICK  
Acting United States Attorney  
District of Arizona  
MARK J. WENKER  
Arizona State Bar Number 018187  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Two Renaissance Square  
40 North Central Avenue, Suite 1800  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4408  
Telephone: (602) 514-7500  
[mark.wenker@usdoj.gov](mailto:mark.wenker@usdoj.gov)  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

United States of America,  
Plaintiff,  
v.

21,880 Counterfeit 3M N95 Model 1860  
and Model 1860S Masks,

Defendants *In Rem*.

**VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR  
FORFEITURE *IN REM***

Plaintiff United States of America brings this Complaint and alleges as follows in accordance with Rule G(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Supplemental Rules for Admiralty or Maritime Claims and Asset Forfeiture Actions (“Supplemental Rules”):

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This is a civil action *in rem*, brought to enforce the provisions of 19 U.S.C. § 1526(b) and (e) for forfeiture of merchandise imported into the United States that bears a trademark owned by citizen of, or by a corporation or association created or organized within, the United States without the written consent of the owner of the trademark, in violation of 19 U.S.C. § 1526(a).

2. This is a civil action *in rem*, brought to enforce the provisions of 19 U.S.C. §§ 1337 and 1526 for forfeiture of articles imported into the United States with a false or fraudulent trademark, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1124.



1           11. In early February 2021, SPO received the defendant property in their  
2 warehouse. SPO noticed that the packaging materials and the masks themselves appeared  
3 different than other 3M branded masks in their inventory.

4           12. Because of concerns about the authenticity of the defendant property, on  
5 February 18, 2021 the SPO contacted the 3M Covid-19 Fraud, Price Gouging and  
6 Counterfeit Product Response Team and provided several photos of the masks and their  
7 boxes, as well as details regarding the transaction.

8           13. On February 27, 2021, an SPO employee contacted a management  
9 representative with TUV Rheinland Greater China to corroborate the inspection report.  
10 On March 1, 2021, the TUV Rheinland management representative informed the SPO  
11 employee that the inspection report in question was not issued by TUV Rheinland.

12           14. On March 2, 2021, 3M Office of Intellectual Property Counsel confirmed  
13 the defendant 3M masks were counterfeit.

14           15. On March 15, 2021, HSI Special Agents responded to a State of Arizona  
15 warehouse located at 3949 W. Van Buren Road, Phoenix, Arizona where officers from  
16 DOA identified 21,880 3M N95 masks from the shipment received by Core X which they  
suspected to be counterfeit.

17           16. 3M owns numerous federal trademark registrations for its 3M Mark,  
18 including, among others, U.S. Reg. Nos. 3,398,329, 2,692,036, and 2,793,534.

19           17. HSI investigators examined and inventoried the masks and the associated  
20 packaging containing 3M trademarks. After receiving independent confirmation from  
21 3M Fraud representatives that the masks were not authentic 3M product, HSI seized the  
22 defendant property.

23           18. On April 5, 2021 DHS issued a summons to Core X, directing the company  
24 to provide all records and communications related to the purchase, transfer, importation  
25 and sale of the defendant property, as well as any information regarding the origin of the  
faked TUV Rheinland inspection report.

26           19. On April 20, 2021, HSI SA Lazna received several documents from an  
27 attorney representing Core X.  
28

1           20. The documents indicated Core X had purchased the masks from an  
2 Oklahoma company, Kairos Health Services (Kairos), and that the sale had been  
3 facilitated by a Pennsylvania company, Community Health Trilogy, Inc. (CHT).

4           21. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) entry records showed that a  
5 shipment, including the 22,000 counterfeit 3M masks, originated in Hong Kong, with a  
6 transshipment and final importation location of Singapore.

7           22. As of July 12, 2021, 3M's Fraud, Price Gouging and Counterfeit Product  
8 Response Team estimated that nearly 42 million counterfeit respirators had been seized  
9 domestically since the beginning of the global pandemic.

10           23. As counterfeit masks often use inferior materials and construction methods  
11 and do not properly fit the user, they represent a significant health risk to both medical  
12 professionals and the public at large.

13           24. Genuine 3M N95 masks contain advanced filter material and are designed  
14 to be tight fitting, forming a seal with the wearer's face, so inhaled air only passes through  
15 the filter instead of going around the edges of the mask.

16           25. Genuine 3M N95 masks contain proprietary, advanced electrostatic  
17 microfiber media to capture particles.

18           26. Counterfeit 3M masks can endanger the health and safety of the wearer and  
19 public as they do not have 3M's advanced filter material, are not designed to be tight  
20 fitting, do not contain 3M's proprietary, advanced electrostatic material, and are not  
21 tested by NIOSH.

22           27. Counterfeit masks are not designed, tested or approved to ensure they  
23 perform as advertised or expected.

24           28. 3M has issued periodic counterfeit alerts to combat this fraud. One such  
25 alert, published on February 11, 2021, noted, among other things:

- 26           a. All 3M model 1860, 1860S, and 1870+ respirators imported into the United  
27 States from any other country are likely to be counterfeit.
- 28           b. All 3M model 1860, 1860S, and 1870+ respirators exported from  
China/Hong Kong should be viewed as counterfeit.

1 c. No one should rely upon TUV, SGS or similar certification reports. All  
2 shipments of 3M model 1860, 1860S, and 1870+ respirators accompanied  
3 by a TUV, SGS, or similar certification report are likely counterfeit.

4 29. Despite this alert, CoreX acquired the defendant property from overseas  
5 with a TUV certification and then sold the defendant property to the State of Arizona.

6 30. On April 27, 2021, Kevin Rhodes, 3M Senior Vice President and Deputy  
7 General Counsel, presented written testimony to the Senate Subcommittee on Consumer  
8 Protection, Product Safety, and Data Security, in which he testified that:

9 Genuine 3M N95 respirators contain advanced filter material and are  
10 designed to be tight fitting, forming a seal with the wearer's face, so inhaled air  
11 passes through the filter (instead of going around the edges). 3M N95 respirators  
12 contain proprietary, advanced electrostatic microfiber media to capture particles.  
13 3M's unique manufacturing process injects an electrostatic charge into the  
14 microfibers, which are arranged in an open formation, allowing for easier passage  
15 of air while also enhancing the capture of airborne particles. 3M N95 respirators  
16 are also designed to seal to the wearer's face-as fit and seal are critical to  
17 respirator performance. 3M N95 respirators are tested on an ongoing basis to  
18 ensure they meet filtration efficiently requirements and other performance  
19 criteria specified in applicable government regulations. 3M has strict quality  
20 controls and manufacturing standards to help ensure the consistent high  
21 performance and consistent fit of our products.

22 31. In late May of 2021, in response to DHS summons issued to Kairos and  
23 CHT, SA Lanza received emails from company officers for Kairos and CHT.

24 32. The emails contained compressed files with documents that had been  
25 requested pursuant to two additional DHS summons issued to both these companies.  
26 Initial review of the documents indicated that Kairos purchased the counterfeit masks  
27 from a supplier in China.  
28

1           33. Kairos used a customs brokerage company in Staten Island, NY – Global  
2 Trade Link, Inc. (GTL) – to facilitate the importation of the masks. CHT acted as a  
3 general broker/sales company, arranging the sale of the masks from Kairos to Core X.

4           34. Information in HSI databases indicated GTL, as well as one of its other  
5 client companies, CovCare, may be involved in the importation and/or sale of counterfeit  
6 3M respirator masks in the United States.

7           35. Additionally, investigators believe CovCare may have initially provided  
8 the fake TUV Rheinland report to GTL and Kairos for the Arizona SPO shipment.

9           36. The government attempted to administratively forfeit the defendant  
10 property. After Core X filed a claim for defendant property, the claim was referred to  
11 the Phoenix office of the U.S. Attorney to initiate judicial proceedings.

12           37. On November 15, 2021, Philip Eitzman, a 3M Product Development  
13 Engineer who has worked at 3M since November 1991, opined as to the authenticity of  
14 the defendant property (the “Authenticity Report”). The Authenticity Report is attached  
15 as Exhibit A.

16           38. Mr. Eitzman has personal knowledge as a designer and developer of 3M's  
17 N95 respirators and he reviewed photographs and other records submitted to the 3M  
18 Fraud Hotline, as well as review of other records kept by 3M in the ordinary course of its  
19 business.

20           39. Mr. Eitzman has extensive training and experience identifying counterfeit  
21 3M-brand N95 respirators and differentiating them from authentic 3M products.

22           40. Counterfeit products are determined to mean any products that did not  
23 originate from a 3M manufactured facility.

24           41. 3M received photographs of the defendant property and packaging  
25 delivered by Core X to the State of Arizona and determined that the defendant property  
26 is counterfeit.

27           42. Specifically, the printing on the defendant property did not conform to the  
28 known characteristics of printing present on authentic 3M 1860 and 1860S masks and the

1 construction of the property did not conform to the known characteristics of authentic  
2 3M 1860 and 1860S respirators.

3 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

4 The defendant property is merchandise imported into the United States that bears a  
5 trademark owned by citizen of, or by a corporation or association created or organized  
6 within, the United States without the written consent of the owner of the trademark and  
7 therefore is subject to forfeiture pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 1526(b) and (e).

8 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

9 The defendant property represents articles imported into the United States with a  
10 false or fraudulent trademark and therefore is subject to forfeiture pursuant to 19 U.S.C. §§  
11 1337 and 1526.

12 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

13 The defendant property represents articles previously imported into the United  
14 States in violation of law and therefore is subject to forfeiture and therefore is subject to  
15 forfeiture pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 1337(i).

16 WHEREFORE, the United States of America prays that due notice be given to all  
17 parties, to appear and show cause why the forfeiture should not be decreed; that judgment  
18 be entered declaring the defendant property be forfeited to the United States of America  
19 for disposition according to law; and that the United States of America be granted such  
20 other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper, together with the costs and  
21 disbursements of this action.

22 Respectfully submitted this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of November 2021.

23 GLENN B. McCORMICK  
24 Acting United States Attorney  
25 District of Arizona

26 

---

MARK J. WENKER  
27 Assistant United States Attorney  
28